

MINUTES

Reauthorization Committee of Colorado Council of Deans of Education (CCODE)

October 25, 2011, 3:00-5:00pm

DHE, Emily Griffith Conference Room

Present: Jennie Whitcomb, Valerie Dobbs, Donna Cooner, Emmy Glancy, Ian Macgillivray, Beth Bean, Sara Dallman, Suzie Perry, Mary Snyder, Mike Taber, Joan Schunck (TNTP), Hai Huynh (TNTP), Kristin Klopfenstein, Carolyn Haug

1. Follow up on items identified at the CCODE Fall retreat.

- Next CCODE meeting is January 20, 2012. We will use the next Reauthorization Committee meeting (January 10, 2012) to plan for the CCODE meeting on January 20. Ian invited the following non-CCODE individuals to both the January 10 Reauthorization meeting and the January 20 CCODE meeting: Hai Huynh and Jim Furman (TNTP), Carolyn Haug (UCD), Lisa Bradley (CDE), Kristin Klopfenstein (UNC). These individuals were invited because of their work with CCODE on the Educator ID System.
- CCODE agenda for January 20, 2012 will look something like this:
 - 1) Data collection and analysis project (CDE HR File, DHE Ed Prep File)—UCD/UCB/UNC pilot and TNTP work to date.
 - 2) Common Survey for Completers and Employers. Piloted by UCD and UCB. Who else would like to pilot? Discussion on items to flag for removal OR to keep as a common core.
 - 3) Data Platforms (TK20, Taskstream, LiveText, etc.). Is there one that is more compatible with state data files?
 - 4) Data Advisory Group (DAG). Make sure Institutional Reporting folks from private and proprietary ed prep programs are included in discussions to ensure accurate data reporting to SURDS.
 - 5) TNTP/CDE/DHE Educator Pipeline Project update.
- For educator preparation programs that are interested in obtaining their linked CDE HR File and DHE Educator Preparation File data, the person to contact is Beth.Bean@dhe.state.co.us (303-866-2661). Please be advised that there are important security measures to consider before data can be released.

2. Update on common survey to use with graduates and employers. (Carolyn and Jennie)

- Carolyn and Jennie discussed the pilot. See attached "Update on Teacher Education Follow-up Survey Project."
- Questions for CCODE/CDE/DHE to consider: Is this formative or summative data? Who owns the data? How do we want to use the data? Does Ohio's Pathways Project provide a good example to follow? Does anybody else in CCODE want to pilot this survey in 2012? Can we agree on a common core of items we'll all use?
- It's not possible to add educators' email addresses to HR File (this idea was mentioned last time as a way to get current e-mails to send them the survey).
- Jennie or her designee will check with other institutions about using items from their item banks so we don't violate any proprietary rights. Ian will help with state contacts for permission where necessary.

3. The Obama Administration's Plan for Teacher Education Reform and Improvement

- Regarding the report at <http://www.ed.gov/sites/default/files/our-future-our-teachers.pdf>, Colorado is well positioned with the Educator ID System, the analysis of graduate placement and

retention data that CDE and DHE are completing right now, and the surveys for program graduates and their principals that the Reauthorization Committee of CCODE is developing. We will stay tuned to Congress's ESEA reauthorization. Not much we can do right now.

4. NCATE Blue Ribbon Panel and Alliance for Clinical-Based Teacher Preparation

- Colorado is one of about 9 alliance states.
- Jim Cibulka (NCATE) is willing to come to a CCODE meeting in Colorado to discuss Colorado's involvement.
- Upcoming webinar on November 10, 2:00-4:00pm. Jami, Ian and Donna Cooner are attending. Ian is seeking permission from NCATE for more CCODE members to attend.
- Purpose of webinar is:
 - Share Alliance State progress
 - Discuss the Environmental Scans (Ian can provide with a copy of this. Was distributed at April 2011 CCODE Retreat at DU.)
 - Introduce new and interested Alliance States
 - Discuss how to promote the work of the State Alliance within the states
 - Discuss the AIMS electronic State Alliance Work Page
 - Seek state or regional foundation funding

5. Next meeting: Tuesday, January 10, 2012, 3:00 – 5:00pm at DHE or via phone.

Update on Teacher Education Follow-up Survey Project
CCODE Reauthorization Committee
Oct. 25, 2011

Background

Haug & Whitcomb developed and will pilot in fall 2011 a Teacher Education Follow Up Survey to be administered to recent graduates of initial teacher preparation programs and their employers. Below follow steps taken.

Survey Development Steps

1. Review surveys both institutions were currently using, as well as several other IHE surveys from other institutions across the country (i.e., Ohio Teacher Quality Partnership (2003-04), Darling-Hammond's, *Powerful Teacher Education*, Appendix B (2006), Boston College Teachers for a New Era Exit Survey (2006), North Carolina Working Conditions (2005-2006), St. Cloud State follow-up survey
2. We mapped onto the summer 2011 draft Colorado Teaching Standards (which are likely to be adopted in spring 2012), as well as a set of major domains the NEW TE FOLLOW UP SURVEY should address:
 - a. Planning
 - b. Instruction
 - c. Assessment
 - d. Classroom Management
 - e. Diversity
 - f. Technology
 - g. Literacy
 - h. Mathematics
 - i. Parent/Community
 - j. Professional Life
 - k. Working Conditions
 - l. Demographic
 - m. Apply Learning Theory
3. Summary of PILOT TE FOLLOW UP SURVEY Features
 - 121=total items
 - 77=Likert-like about program graduate's perception of teacher prep
 - 4= open-ended
 - 12=Likert-like about program graduate's perception of current working conditions
 - 12=Likert-like about program graduate's perception about extent to which the program prepared them to expect their current working conditions
 - 7=demographic
 - 9=background on current teaching position & hiring process

All but two of the DRAFT Teaching Standards are addressed in the survey. Most new Teaching Standards are addressed with multiple items, ranging from 2-11 items. The standards not addressed in the survey address teachers demonstrating leadership, which are areas we feel not best addressed through self-report.
4. UCD faculty served as an expert panel to review items for PILOT survey.

Status of Pilot

1. Launched 9/26/2011. Reminder email sent a week ago. We will close it approximately Oct. 31.
2. As of today, 10/25: UCD – 100 completions, 20 partials, and UCB – 4 completions, 1 partial
3. Survey is on Zoomerang
4. Email distribution of two links: 1) a 40 second video of the UCD Director of Teacher Education encouraging them to complete it, explaining why it's important to the program, and informing them of the chance to win one of four \$50 Amazon gift cards in the lottery, and 2) the survey
5. Email addresses were looked up using the DHE data file received this summer (the CDE HR data). Our email bounce back rate was quite low ($118/2623=4.5\%$). Our method to achieve such accuracy with the email addresses was to 1) look up the nomenclature for each district and follow the pattern to generate the most likely email addresses; 2) for common names (e.g., Jim Jones), we made an attempt to individually look people up within the school/district websites.
6. We sent the email to all 2623 UCD enrollees in our DHE file for whom we could locate email addresses, although we know some of them are principals, some are graduates of other programs at UCD (like school psych or advanced endorsements), and some were not our completers. We did not have enough time to sort through the list prior to sending the survey out. At this point, we know that there are approximately 750 initial licensure completers in our data file, so the current response rate is based on this number ($100/750=13\%$). It is low.
7. The UCB group is a select set of people who did not respond to the UCB spring 2011 follow-up survey. The response rate is even lower ($4/50=8\%$), but that is among a group who already chose not to respond to an earlier survey, so isn't really comparable. In any case, the response rate is low and the 17% partially complete rate might indicate that the survey is too long.

Next steps:

1. **November-December:** UCD will conduct following analyses that will inform decisions about stability and redundancy of items: (1) factor analyses, (2) analysis of completion rates, and (3) analysis of partial completion rates.
2. **December:** Invite Reauthorization members to participate in discussion of analyses in item 1 to flag items and recommend items that should be kept or can be eliminated. (Stats experience relevant)
3. **January-February:** Full Reauthorization members discuss recommendations and decisions re: refined tool that will be either shared with all institutions and/or a subset of items will be selected to form a "common set of items" that all institutions agree to include in their respective follow up surveys.
 - o Not sure if this committee should engage CCODE at this point and need input from DHE/CDE on what role/resource want to play/provide to conduct state-wide survey
 - o Decide whether to conduct expert panel reviews of survey from Employers or other stakeholders.
 - o Secure permission to use any items that are derived from other sources (e.g., see surveys noted in survey development discussion above)
4. **February-April:** Institutions voluntarily administer surveys to program completers. UCD & UCD will share set up in Zoomerang, but each institution will need to reformat on own survey platform, following set up logic as closely as possible.
5. **February-April:** Reauthorization sub-group creates template for all institutions to report aggregate mean/SD (or % responses) for common set of items.
6. **May-June:** Institutions voluntarily aggregate data? Who owns this data?